

physicians, and particularly endocrinologists and pediatricians, concerned over the short stature of their children.

In many cases, these children are technically within the normal range for height (taller than the 3rd percentile for age). Even in these children, however, and particularly in those well below the 2 standard deviations of height for age, short stature is a major psychosocial problem in childhood. This results in many similar problems in adult life. Physicians caring for these children need to take the perceived problem seriously and to arrive at a diagnosis as expeditiously as possible by a combination of family history, careful serial growth measurements and, in some cases, hormonal and radiologic investigations.

The diagnostic approach presented in the accompanying article is extremely useful. By following this or a similar diagnostic schema, physicians should develop a straightforward approach to the diagnosis of cases of short stature. Particularly important is the quick separation of those who are essentially normal (normal short stature or constitutional delay) from those who have pathologic causes of their short stature. This avoids unnecessary testing of children who are essentially normal, while leading to a definitive diagnosis in those who have definable syndromes. Recent work in the use of synthetic growth hormone in cases of Turner's syndrome² gives hope that this type of treatment may be useful in a number of specific disorders.

The question remains open as to whether some children who are otherwise normal except for their short stature might respond to therapeutic doses of growth hormone. Small-scale studies suggest that at least short-term increases in growth rate may be achieved in some cases by therapeutic administration of growth hormone.^{3,4} It is important to stress, however, that no one has shown any long-term benefit of growth hormone treatment for any of this group of children. Because synthetic growth hormone treatment remains relatively untried and expensive (an average of \$15,000 per year at present prices and dosages), prudent physicians should remain cautious and skeptical until large-scale controlled studies are done. In the meantime, it is important to provide reassurance and counseling to those children and their parents who are essentially normal and can well expect to achieve adult stature within the normal range. These patients should neither be ignored nor subjected to the indiscriminate use of synthetic hormone in an attempt to create an Orwellian world where human variation is discouraged and eliminated.

RAYMOND L. HINTZ, MD
*Department of Pediatrics
 Stanford University Medical Center
 Stanford, California*

REFERENCES

1. Gillis JS: Too Tall, Too Small. Champaign, Ill, Institute for Personality and Ability Testing, 1982
2. Rosenfeld RG, Hintz RL, Johansson AJ: A prospective randomized trial of methionyl human growth hormone and/or oxandrolone in Turner's syndrome. Second Joint Meeting of the Lawson Wilkins Pediatric Endocrine Society/European Society for Pediatric Endocrinology, 1985
3. Van Vliet G, Styne DM, Kaplan SL, et al: Growth hormone treatment for short stature. *N Engl J Med* 1983; 309:1016-1022
4. Gertner JM, Genel M, Gianfredi SP, et al: Prospective clinical trial of human growth hormone in short children without growth hormone deficiency. *J Pediatr* 1984; 104:172-176

Group Think

A NUMBER of events in the news bring to mind the concept of "group think" which Irving Janis, a recently retired pro-

fessor at Yale University and now an adjunct professor at the University of California at Berkeley, has put forth for more than a decade.

In group think, loyalty to the group requires that the members of the group ignore important, even crucial, information that conflicts with a collective group view with which most of the group are comfortable. Group think can have serious untoward consequences. A classic example, often cited, is the failure of American automakers to understand and respond to the public demand for smaller, higher quality, fuel efficient cars that grew out of the oil shortages in the 1970s. The American automakers were more comfortable building large cars and failed to take into account data they did not want to hear about and which made them uncomfortable as a group. Foreign automakers did listen, were not uncomfortable as a group (indeed quite the opposite) and moved rapidly into a hungry American market. In fact they are still here. There are many other examples where groups that have an intrinsic, almost blind, loyalty within themselves have failed to take into any serious account disturbing information that would challenge the decisions reached through undisturbed group think.

To this writer, group think appears to be a very widespread and real phenomenon by no means limited to automakers. Wherever it affects leaders and decision makers, whether in business, government, health care or anywhere else, unnecessary and costly mistakes can occur, and too often do. In times such as these, the group think phenomenon deserves much more attention than it seems to be receiving.

MSMW

Diagnosing Intussusception

IN 1979 Dr Nyhan and his group presented six cases of infants and children with intussusception.¹ In four of these patients, the clinical presentation followed the classic triad of intermittent colicky abdominal pain, vomiting and bloody, mucoid (currant-jelly) stool. In two additional infants, the clinical presentation was "atypical," characterized by profound lethargy, apathy and prostration suggesting shock or sepsis, or there was crying and arching of the back to suggest a central nervous system process such as meningitis or encephalitis. In this issue, Dr Nyhan's group has reviewed five additional patients with intussusception having unique clinical presentations. They emphasize once again that intussusception may mimic acute central nervous system disease, prompting diagnostic studies such as lumbar puncture and computed tomographic scans of the head.

It is refreshing to note that Dr Nyhan reviewed these patients in a residents' conference, and, from the symptoms and physical findings, they elicited from the participants a list of differential diagnoses. This exercise in stressing diagnostic possibilities based on clinical features should be emphasized as much in current times as it was in previous eras when elegant diagnostic facilities were not so readily available. Laboratory tests and diagnostic imaging studies make medical practice far easier today, but the waste in time, labor and cost is appalling when a history and physical examination would suffice. We in medicine must return to the discipline of being clinicians, wherein we focus our thinking based on symptoms and signs and develop confidence in our course of action. We should condemn the "shotgun" batteries of tests that prevail in medical teaching centers today. There can be little justifica-